Academic Program Review



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ACADEMIC YEAR** | 2013-2014 | [ ]  Basic Skills [x]  **Transfer**  [ ]  Career Technical Education (CTE) |
| **PROGRAM** | Communication Arts |
| **DEPARTMENT** | Speech Department |
| **DIVISION** | Arts, Letters and Learning Services |
| **SUBMITTER** | Laura Mosier March 3, 2014 |

**I. INSTITUTIONAL GOALS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**1** | **INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS** – The College will maintain programs and services that focus on the mission of the College supported by data-driven assessments to measure student learning and student success. |
| INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**2** | **STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES** – The College will maintain instructional programs and services which support student success and the attainment of student educational goals. |
| INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**3** | **RESOURCES** – The College will develop and manage human, technological, physical, and financial resources to effectively support the College mission and the campus learning environment. |
| INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**4** | **LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE** – The Board of Trustees and the Superintendent/President will establish policies that assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services, and the financial stability of the institution. |

**II. PROGRAM GOALS**

1. **PAST – EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS CYCLE OBJECTIVES/PROGRAM GOALS (SET IN PREVIOUS YEAR)**

List your previous objectives/goals and associated Institutional Goals. All program goals must address at least one of the institutional goals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PAST PROGRAM GOALS**Hiring more full-time, qualified, Speech instructors is our primary goal.  (Describe past program goals.) | **INSTITUTIONAL****GOAL(S)** (Check all that apply.) |
|  |  |  |
| **1** | **PAST PROGRAM GOAL #1** | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Program Goal from Last Program Review:** Hire two fulltime tenure track instructors | [ ]  1[x]  2[x]  3[ ]  4 |
| [ ]  Met | [x]  **Partially Met** | [ ]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:** We were given a billet for ONE speech instructor after requesting TWO replacement fulltime instructors over the past 5 years. The person hired for FALL 2014 replaced the fulltime temporary position, which had been filled for Spring 2013/Fall 2014. The Speech department is in critical need of at least one more full time instructor— for this year. The disparity is huge . . .Please note:* English has 13 Full-time and 11 Part- time instructors,
* ESL has 10 Full-time and 14 Part-time instructors
* **SPEECH has THREE full-time and FOUR part-time instructors.**

In order for IVC students to effectively meet transfer requirements within a reasonable time-an adequate number of qualified Speech instructors must be in the classroom.  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **2** | **PAST PROGRAM GOAL #2** | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Program Goal from Last Program Review: Securing TWO appropriately equipped classrooms to call “Speech” classrooms is imperative** | [ ]  1[x]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4 |
| [x]  **Met** | [ ]  Partially Met | [ ]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:**The Speech Department is now able to claim rooms 315 and 1603 as its own. |
|  |  |  |
| **3** | **PAST PROGRAM GOAL #3** | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Program Goal from Last Program Review: Maintaining the number of students at 25 for SPCH 100 and SPCH 180** | [ ]  1[x]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4 |
| [ ]  Met | [ ]  Partially Met | [x]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:** This goal of maintaining a cap of 25 was pursued by the FT faculty in SPEECH—but was a major failure on the part of IVC.The cap of Speech students was raised from 25 to 28. While this does not appear to be of concern to IVC administrators—it is to the health of the Speech Department—and to the transferability. We spoke adamantly about the importance of **quality speech education**, but IVC compromised this goal in order to save money to help with the budget. After forwarding a letter from the Director of Communication from SDSU regarding raising the CAP, and the reasons he gave for not doing so—a total disregard to all arguments showing the ineffectiveness of raising the cap was implemented anyway by IVC, and the CAP was raised from 25-28. The argument was made that “how could community college instructors do a better job than those instructors who have a CAP of 24 students at the university level?” Please note that the CAP in the Debate class was raised three years ago from 20 to 25 (a 25% increase)—and then again from 25 to 28 this year--totaling a 40% increase from the 20-28 number of students in Speech 180. Public speaking class increases from 25-28 was a 12% hike, but it is imperative that we remember that both Public Speaking and Debate classes are performance courses and need specific amounts of time to fulfill State requirements which is somewhere around 22 minutes of speaking time-per student. |

Comments:

**Institutional Goal 1 states: “**The College will maintain programs and services that focus on the mission of the College supported by data-driven assessments to measure student learning and student success.”

In order to satisfy Goal 1—there must be adequate, QUALIFIED staff to teach speech. So far, only ONE fulltime faculty was approved/authorized to replace the gaping hole left when TWO instructors resigned their posts in 2009. This is a concern regarding GOAL 1 because of the choices made for the level of importance-- many positions in other disciplines have been added, but Speech has been passed over repeatedly...Now we face inadequate number of Speech instructors and a raise in CAP.

**Institutional Goal 2 states**: “The College will maintain instructional programs and services which support student success and the attainment of student educational goals.”

It is impossible to support student success with only 3 Full-time and 4 Part-time instructors. The disparity is interesting. Please note:

English has 13 fulltime and 11 part-time (required for TRANSFER).

ESL has 10 full-time instructors and 14 part-time (NOT required for TRANSFER).

**Institutional Goal 3 states**: “The College will develop and manage human, technological, physical, and financial resources to effectively support the College mission and the campus learning environment.”

Because Goal 1 was not realized—Goal 3 was not met regarding “effectively supporting the College mission and the campus learning environment.” In fact, due to non-educational influences, a lack of order coupled with much confusion existed among the temporary full time instructor and some of the adjunct faculty. Regarding our inadequate number of fulltime faculty—our college has used monies for hiring fulltime faculty have been used in areas that are not REQUIRED for transfer, simply because a process was followed for replacement positions—But Speech has been consistently bypassed when considering “replacement” positions. Bearing in mind that Speech is one of the 4 Golden Courses: SPEECH, ENGLISH, MATH, and SCIENCE—it is hard to ignore the need for the second replacement for speech that was created 5+ years ago. Because of poor decision-making at the end of those who were able to dictate policy, our department has been virtually ignored. Coupled with the attitude that Speech is an easy subject to teach and can be taught by anyone, the exigency in hiring qualified Speech instructors has been ignored.

**Institutional Goal 4 states**: “The Board of Trustees and the Superintendent/President will establish policies that assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services, and the financial stability of the institution.”

In order for this goal to be reached, The Board and Superintendent must enact policies the policies that have been established.

1. **PRESENT – DATA ANALYSIS AND PROGRAM HEALTH**
2. **Summarize and analyze all disaggregated data by day, evening, gender, ethnicity, and distance education regarding enrollments, fill rates, productivity, completion, success, retention, persistence, and transfer.**

(complete a, b, & c). ***Attach graphs or trend data***.

1. **Discuss and chart the trends in enrollment and fill rate for each program by day and evening at the program level.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Term | Day Sections | Day Fill | Day Enroll | Ex Day Sections | Ex Day Fill | EX Day Enroll | Online Sections | Online Fill | Online Enroll |
| Fall 2010 | 20 | 121% | 586 | 6 | 121% | 169 | 2 | 90% | 45 |
| Fall 2011 | 16 | 111% | 444 | 5 | 100% | 125 | 3 | 83% | 62 |
| Fall 2012 | 20 | 99% | 494 | 9 | 92% | 206 | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| Spring 2011 | 18 | 117% | 528 | 6 | 115% | 172 | 3 | 67% | 50 |
| Spring 2012 | 19 | 100% | 476 | 5 | 85% | 106 | 2 | 76% | 38 |
| Spring 2013 | 26 | 92% | 598 | 9 | 88% | 197 | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| Average | 19.8 | 107% | 521.0 | 6.7 | 100.2% | 162.5 | 1.7 | 52.7% | 32.5 |

Day enrollment in the spring 2013 semester was the highest of all 6 semesters analyzed in this Review. After a brief decline in day enrollment in the fall 2011, enrollment has picked up due to an effort to recruit part time faculty and hiring a fulltime temporary instructor in the spring 2013. This is also evident in the extended day enrollment were we are serving more students also. Our hybrid courses proved not to be as attractive for students. We will explore the possibility of redesigning our hybrid courses if we feel there is a need for it.

Fill rates have been steady during the period being analyzed. Our average day fill rate is 107% and our average extended day fill rate is 100%. Our hybrid courses started with a 90% fill rate but it progressively declined. The next graph shows that our faculty has gone to great length to accommodate our student’s needs by accepting crashers, for example, during the fall 2010 we reach the 120% fill rate.

1. **What are the trends in productivity? (WSCH/FTEF) The goal is 525 as per state guidelines. A low number means that we are below target levels for productivity. For example, in a small class that has a mandated cap of 15 students, the fill rate may be 100% but the productivity number (WSCH/FTEF) will be very low. A class with a cap of 40 students with a 100% fill rate will have a productivity number close to or above 525. A new norm has been established as a CAP of 28 students.**

The WSCH/FTEF on target with the prediction that the average number, found in smaller classes, is lower than the 525 number - Since the number of students is low in those classes which are performance-oriented-and the CAP is lower- it would seem that another assessment tool should be created to measure the WSCH/FTEF segment of this report so that the norm is not reported/viewed as a problem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Level Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Speech** |
| Term | Enroll | Fill |  Sections | Mass Cap | Avg Class Cap | Avg Class Size | FTES | FTEF | WSCH/FTEF | Success | Retention | Day Classes | Extended Day Classes | Online Classes |
| Fall 2010 | 800 | 119% | 28 | 675 | 24.11 | 28.57 | 82.8 | 5.6 | 485.71 | 84% | 91% | 21 | 7 | 2 |
| Fall 2011 | 611 | 106% | 23 | 575 | 25 | 26.57 | 63.53 | 4.6 | 451.61 | 83% | 91% | 17 | 6 | 2 |
| Fall 2012 | 700 | 97% | 29 | 725 | 25 | 24.14 | 72.51 | 5.8 | 410.34 | 76% | 86% | 20 | 9 | 0 |
| Spring 2011 | 750 | 111% | 27 | 675 | 25 | 27.78 | 72.51 | 5.4 | 472.22 | 76% | 87% | 19 | 8 | 3 |
| Spring 2012 | 620 | 95% | 26 | 650 | 25 | 23.85 | 64.89 | 5.26 | 430.01 | 85% | 90% | 20 | 6 | 2 |
| Spring 2013 | 795 | 91% | 35 | 875 | 25 | 22.71 | 82.39 | 7 | 386.14 | 79% | 88% | 26 | 9 | 0 |
| % Change from Fall 2010 to Fall 2012 | -13% | -18% | 4% | 7% | 4% | -16% | -12% | 4% | -16% | -9% | -5% | -5% | 29% | -100% |
| % Change from Spring 2011 to Spring 2013 | 6% | -18% | 30% | 30% | 0% | -18% | 14% | 30% | -18% | 3% | 2% | 37% | 13% | -100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Discuss and chart the success and retention rates by day, evening (extended day), and online classes in each program and identify gaps.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Term | Day Enrollment | Day Success Rate | Day Retention Rate | Extended Day Enrollment | Extended Day Success Rate | Extended Day Retention Rate | Online Enrollment | Online Success Rate | Online Retention Rate |
| Fall 2010 | 586 | 88% | 92% | 169 | 82% | 92% | 45 | 47% | 67% |
| Fall 2011 | 445 | 86% | 94% | 125 | 83% | 90% | 62 | 53% | 61% |
| Fall 2012 | 494 | 77% | 88% | 206 | 74% | 82% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Spring 2011 | 528 | 80% | 89% | 172 | 70% | 88% | 50 | 50% | 62% |
| Spring 2012 | 476 | 87% | 91% | 106 | 91% | 92% | 38 | 55% | 71% |
| Spring 2013 | 598 | 77% | 88% | 197 | 82% | 88% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Average | 3648.2 | 82% | 90% | 1137.5 | 79% | 88% | 227.5 | 51% | 65% |

As the data indicates, we have a very good success rate in day and extended day classes. In order to visually appreciate our success and retention rates, we have graphed them separately. The blue bars (day classes) and the red bar (extended day classes) are practically identical. There is only a 3% difference between our day success rate of 82% and our extended day rate of 79%. However, the graph also makes clear that our hybrid courses lag behind in success rate.

A highly similar phenomenon occurs with our retention rates, there is practically no gap between our retention rates in day (90%) and extended day (88%) classes. However, our hybrid classes had a lower success and retention rate as well.

1. **Discuss and chart the success and retention rates in each program and identify gaps for five ethnic groups. (African-American, White, all Hispanics, Other, Unknown).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **African American** | **Hispanic** | **White** | **Other** | **Unknown**  |
|  | **Success** | **Retention** | **Success** | **Retention** | **Success** | **Retention** | **Success** | **Retention** | **Success** | **Retention** |
| Fall 2010 | 100% | 100% | 84% | 91% | 81% | 84% | 100% | 100% | 78% | 84% |
| Fall 2011 | 100% | 100% | 82% | 90% | 81% | 81% | 75% | 75% | 89% | 93% |
| Fall 2012 | 33% | 67% | 76% | 86% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 77% | 83% |
| Spring 2011 | 80% | 80% | 76% | 87% | 82% | 85% | 100% | 100% | 71% | 88% |
| Spring 2012 | 100% | 100% | 87% | 91% | 65% | 71% | 100% | 100% | 79% | 89% |
| Spring 2013 | 33% | 33% | 79% | 89% | 69% | 69% | 100% | 100% | 78% | 88% |
| Total | 74% | 80% | 81% | 89% | 80% | 82% | 79% | 79% | 79% | 87% |

As the data indicates (see highlighted percentages in the table above), success rates between all of the ethnic groups analyzed in this study are above the 70% and Hispanic and White students average out 80% of success rate. Maintaining good success rates regardless of ethnic background, is a direct consequence of our Department’s commitment to quality instruction.

Retention rates are also higher; there is no significant gap between the five different ethnic groups. The lowest retention rate is 79% (Unknown or not identified) and the highest is 89% (Hispanics).

1. **Discuss the trends in the number of degrees or certificates awarded, if applicable.**

The Communication Arts program has awarded 1 degree, while after the creation of the Communication Studies for Transfer we have awarded 6 transfer degrees.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Completion** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Number of Degrees and Certificates Awarded 2010-2011 through 2012-2013 (3 years)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Degrees** | **Awarded** |  | **Certificates** | **Awarded** |
| AA. Communication Arts | 1 |  | N/A | N/A |
| A.A. T Communication Studies | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |

The AAT Communication Studies degree was immediately more popular than the AA Communication Arts degree when offered for the first time a 3 semesters ago.

Current AA, AA-T declared majors are much more numerous which can possibly be attributed to the uncomplicated required course selection in the AA-T program. Also, more speech courses are promised, so students can see the plan. We now need more qualified Speech instructors to teach, which we hope will be remedied by hiring new faculty this year. A serious discussion must take place for the Speech Department to be viable.

1. **What program changes, if any, will you recommend that you expect would have a positive effect on your students in your program, if applicable?**
* The need to hire FULL-TIME instructors is imperative.
* The need to lower the cap to 25 for both SPCH 100 and SPCH 180 courses is imperative.
* The need for SPEECH to be treated equally to its English counterpart and to hire a proportionate number of instructors –to align Speech with ENGLISH transferability, is imperative.
* To ensure Speech Department Academic integrity is maintained when hiring part-time instructors.

 **2. Summarize revisions, additions, deletions, or alternate delivery methods to courses and/or program based**

 **on the last program review.**

* Close the Communication Arts degree—do not allow students to declare as a major
* Promote the Communication Studies degree
* Explore resurrecting the SPCH 100—ONLINE/HYBRID course
* Develop a Communication CERTIFICATE—4 classes: SPCH 100, 120, 130, 150
* Ensure that ALL instructors teach to the COURSE outline of Record
1. **Evaluate the program’s viability by addressing program completion, size (FTES), projections (growing/stable/declining), and quality of outcomes. For CTE programs, also include labor market projections, placement, and performance on external testing/exams (i.e. ASE, NABCEP) and industry-recognized credentials, placement, and performance on external testing or exams (NCLEX, ASC, NAP).**
* Currently, AA-T students would have to attend IVC for several years just to be able to take all of the courses required for completion.
* In spite of the limitations placed on the students, the major is growing.
* The student demand for better course selection is also growing.
* Closely align course offerings to the Program Pathways grid.

**C. FUTURE – LIST OF “SMART” (SPECIFIC** **MEASURABLE ATTAINABLE RELEVANT** **TIME-LIMITED) PROGRAM OBJECTIVES FOR NEXT ACADEMIC YEAR TO ADDRESS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, GROWTH, OR UNMET NEEDS/GOALS. ALL PROGRAM GOALS MUST ADDRESS AT LEAST ONE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FUTURE PROGRAM GOALS**(Describe future program goals. List in order of budget priority.) | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** (Check all that apply.) |
|  |  |
| **1** | **FUTURE PROGRAM GOAL #1**Budget Priority #1 | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Goal:** Match the Communications Studies program to demand among the student body at IVC.  | [x]  1[x]  2[x]  3[ ]  4 |
| **Objective:** To hire adequate number of full time instructors who can teach all degree transfer courses – thereby, giving speech majors an opportunity to take the necessary courses within a 2-year graduation time line and to be equally yoked with other REQUIRED for TRANSFER disciplines. |
| **Task(s):** Hire more instructors and add more major courses to the schedule. This would do two things—1) enable student success and eliminate negative image of Speech instructors.  |
| **Timeline:** 2014-2020 |
| **EXPENSE TYPE** | **FUNDING TYPE** | **RESOURCE PLAN**(Check all that apply.) | **BUDGET REQUEST** |
| [ ]  One-Time[x]  Recurring | [ ]  Categorical Specify:       | [ ]  General Fund | [ ]  Facilities[x]  Marketing[ ]  Technology[ ]  Professional Development[x]  Staffing | $80,000 |
|  |  |
| **2** | **FUTURE PROGRAM GOAL #2**Budget Priority #2 | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Goal:** Provide more effective instructional ratios in Speech classes.  | [x]  1[x]  2[x]  3[ ]  4 |
| **Objective:** Reduce the class size for Speech from 28-25 |
| **Task(s):** WLSC Coordinator/Chair and Speech instructors present arguments to appropriate Participatory Governance bodies, including Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, and College Council  |
| **Timeline:** Effective Fall 2014 |
| **EXPENSE TYPE** | **FUNDING TYPE** | **RESOURCE PLAN**(Check all that apply.) | **BUDGET REQUEST** |
| [ ]  One-Time[x]  Recurring | [ ]  Categorical Specify:  | [ ]  General Fund | [ ]  Facilities[ ]  Marketing[ ]  Technology[ ]  Professional Development[x]  Staffing | loss of extra student-FTES |
| **3** | **FUTURE PROGRAM GOAL #3**Budget Priority #3 | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Goal:** Provide Speech students incentive to master Speech Communication skills. | [x]  1[x]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4 |
| **Objective:** To create and offer a Speech Certificate for students which will be comprised of the following:1. SPCH 100-Oral Communication
2. SPCH 120-Interpersonal Communication
3. SPCH 130-Small Group Communication
4. SPCH 150-Intercultural Communication
 |
| **Task(s):** WLSC Coordinator/Chair and Speech instructors present arguments to Curriculum Committee. |
| **Timeline:** Develop the Certificate Fall 2014  |
| **EXPENSE TYPE** | **FUNDING TYPE** | **RESOURCE PLAN**(Check all that apply.) | **BUDGET REQUEST** |
| [ ]  One-Time[ ]  Recurring | [ ]  Categorical Specify:       | [ ]  General Fund | [ ]  Facilities[ ]  Marketing[ ]  Technology[ ]  Professional Development[ ]  Staffing | $0 |
|  | Not sure |
| **TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST** | . |

1. How will your enhanced budget request improve student success?

The budget would not necessarily be impacted.

Our students will have an opportunity to become more effective in 4 Basic Life Areas:

SOCIAL

VOCATIONAL

ACADEMIC
 CIVIC

Comments: Most entry level positions require “excellent communication skills.” A certificate in Speech Communication would be

extremely beneficial to our students’ career path. This certificate would also be more quickly earned and obtained by students who wish to become gainfully employed while finishing their college coursework. Many students have remarked that they would go for a certificate in Speech because of its practicality. This is a practical solution and can be used a placeholder while working on a major degree.

**III. INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (ISLOs)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ISLO 1** | COMMUNICATION SKILLS |
| **ISLO 2** | CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS |
| **ISLO 3** | PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY |
| **ISLO 4** | INFORMATION LITERACY |
| **ISLO 5** | GLOBAL AWARENESS |

**IV. PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES**(Describe learning outcomes.) | **ISLO(S)** [Link PLO to appropriate ISLO(s).] |
|  |  |  |
| **PLO****1** | **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME #1** | **ISLO(S)** |
| **Identify Program Outcome:**      **Students will be able to construct and articulate a basic case for a parliamentary debate.** | [x]  ISLO 1[x]  ISLO 2[x]  ISLO 3[x]  ISLO 4[x]  ISLO 5 |
| **Measurable Outcome Summary:**      72 Students were required to write a case which means to explain BOTH sides of a controversial issue: 68 Students followed the directions and wrote, as assigned.4 Students wrote for either the proposition or opposition—**not both sides**, which indicated probable bias. |
| [ ]  Met | [x]  Partially Met | [ ]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:**      Thorough explanation of importance of an argument being debatable on both sides and unbiased in the writing of good reasons for a proposition. |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PLO****2** | **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME #2** | **ISLO(S)** |
| **Identify Program Outcome:**      **Students will be able to recognize and avoid using 15 logical fallacies during classroom presentations.**  | [x]  ISLO 1[x]  ISLO 2[x]  ISLO 3[x]  ISLO 4[x]  ISLO 5 |
| **Measurable Outcome Summary:**       |
| [ ]  Met | [ ]  Partially Met | [x]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:**      Assessing this semester. |
|  |  |  |
| **PLO****3** | **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME #3** | **ISLO(S)** |
| **Identify Program Outcome:**      **Students will be able to write and submit five properly-worded debate propositions.** | [x]  ISLO 1[x]  ISLO 2[x]  ISLO 3[x]  ISLO 4[x]  ISLO 5 |
| **Measurable Outcome Summary:**      One hundred thirty-nine (139) students were tested at some time during the semester on their ability to write out five debate propositions. Each Student was given a test.The results showed that of the 139 students:5 students wrote three propositions, 6 students wrote four, and the remaining 128 students successfully wrote out 5 properly-worded debate propositions. |
| [ ]  Met | [x]  Partially Met | [ ]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:**       Improvements could mean working with debate teams to establish the best results when writing propositions. |
|  |  |  |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  **PLO/SLO GRID** |
| Course | units | # SLOs Identified | Fall 2010 | Spring 2011 | Fall 2011 | Spring 2012 | Fall 2012 | Spring 2013 |
| Speech 100 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| Speech 110 | 3 | 4 | 4 |   |   |   |   |   |
| Speech 120  | 3 | 3 |   |   |   |   |   | 1 |
| Speech 130 | 3 | 3 |   | 2 |   |   |   |   |
| Speech 150 | 3 | 5 |   |   | 5 |   |   |   |
| Speech 180 | 3 | 4 | 2 |   | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: |
|   |
| Not all SLOs have been assessed.  |
|   |
| PLO Grid |
|   |
| **Program** | **PLOs Identified** | **Fall 2010** | **Spring 2011** | **Fall 2011** | **Spring 2012** | **Fall 2012** | **Spring 2013** | **Fall 2012** |
| **Speech**  | **3** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Speech**  | 3 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |

 |